DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 888 EA 020 535

AUTHOR McBee, Maridyth M.; Fink, John S.
TITLE How One School District Implemented Site-Based School Improvement Planning Teams.
PUB DATE Jun 88
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Parent Participation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Oklahoma City Public Schools

ABSTRACT

Recent educational literature has stressed the benefits of site-based management and parental involvement in school programs. To capitalize on these benefits, site-based planning teams designed to involve perents, teachers, administrators, students, and community members were developed by the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities and piloted in nine Oklahoma City schools. The plan involved participants in a five-stage school improvement cycle (readiness, planning, training, implementing, and maintaining). During 1986-87, eight local schools began organizing site-based planning teams. To determine how these teams were functioning, two group facilitators at each site were interviewed. At that time, the schools were in various stages of program development. Even though the cycle had not been completed, school improvements, such as better school climate, were already occurring at each site. Also, most schools had increased parental and/or community support. Some implementation difficulties were reported, such as afterschool overtime to carry out group charges, maintaining an active planning team after a principal was changed, and keeping community and business representatives on the teams. However, as benefits seemed to outweigh the costs, continued support for the site-based school improvement planning teams was recommended. Included are one table and seven references. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302888

How One School District Implemented Site-Based School Improvement Planning Teams

by

Maridyth M. McBee
Oklahoma City Public Schools

and

John S. Fink
Oklahoma City Public Schools

June, 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. M. McBee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 535

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

School improvement planning teams, developed by the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, were designed to involve parents, teachers, administrators, students and community members in a five-stage cycle to help enhance the quality of schools. The five stages were readiness, planning, training, implementing and maintaining. During 1986-87, eight local schools began organizing site-based planning teams. To determine how the planning teams were functioning, the authors interviewed two group facilitators at each site. At the time of the interviews, the schools were at various stages of development in the program. Even though the five-stage cycle had not been completed, school improvements, such as better school climate, were already occurring at each site. Also, most schools had increased parental and/or community support. There were some difficulties in carrying out the program, such as the many after school hours required to complete the charge of the groups. Other problems were the difficulty in maintaining an active planning team after the school principal was changed and in recruiting and keeping community and business representatives on the teams. However, as the benefits seemed to outweigh the costs, continued support for the site-based school improvement planning teams was recommended.

Educational literature of the past few years has devoted considerable attention to site-based management. This management concept empowers teachers, principals and community members to plan and implement educational programs that meet the unique needs of their particular school. Burnes and Howes (1988) identified a number of principles on which site-based management was based such as: a) Efforts to change schools have been most effective when they have been focused toward influencing the entire school culture in a risk-free, collegial atmosphere; b) and change in the total organization is fostered through worker participation in project planning and imlementation with encouragement and acceptance of the results by superiors. Site-based management has been tried in a number of school systems like Hammond, Indiana, Dade County, Florida, and Chesterfield Missouri (Casner-Lotto, 1988, Dreyfuss, 1988, Burnes and Howes, 1988).

In the last decade there has also been a substantial number of studies which found that parent involvement in school programs produce students who perform better in school than students whose parents are not involved (Henderson, 1987). It appears that children benefit when parents are involved in school, no matter what the nature of that involvement. Programs with a parental component appear to be more successful than those with the school

staff acting alone (Becher, 1984; Leler, 1983; Goodson and Hess, 1975). To capitalize on the benefits of site-based management and parental involvement in the schools, site-based planning teams were piloted in nine district schools.

During the fall of 1986, teams of three persons from each pilot school were trained to facilitate the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. (/I/D/E/A/) School Improvement Program. This study was conducted to determine how the program was implemented in those schools, what has occurred in those schools as a result of participation in the program, and how the experience of implementing the program might benefit other schools that will be beginning the program at some future point in time.

What Is The School Improvement Program?

The School Improvement Program was designed to involve parents, teachers, administrators, students, and interested community members in a five-stage cycle for school improvement. The five stages were readiness, planning, training, implementing and maintaining.

To begin this process, a principal, a teacher, and a parent from each school attended two one-week training sessions on how to conduct a School Improvement Program. These people then become the facilitators for the school improvement process at their building.

The facilitators' first responsibility was to form a planning team for their building. Representatives from the community, teaching staff, parents, students, and administration were to be included on the planning team. This team met for approximately 30 hours to determine a vision of what they would like for their school to become in five years. The vision was based on nine principles of education. These nine principles are found in Table 1. The planning team also assessed the school's readiness to change.

Insert Table 1 about here

Once the long-range visioning has occurred, the planning team was to participate in a two to three day retreat. During the retreat, the team developed goals for their school based on the nine principles. The goals were prioritized. Then the team compared the present school with their idealized vision to identify strengths and areas in need of change.

As the next step, the facilitators formed a "design task" group. The membership of the design task group (as was the membership of the planning team) was to be representative of all the stakeholders in the school. There was to be overlap in membership between the two groups to maintain continuity.

The purpose of the design task group was to prepare detailed program plans to meet the goals developed at the retreat. While it was understood that not all goals could be met at once, the first year plan included practices that would lead to the attainment of the primary goals.

The design task group reported the program plan to the original planning team for modifications. The planning team then determined a method for communicating the plan to all those who would be affected by its implementation. The final tasks of the planning stage were to identify participants, plan needed staff development, and determine the coordinating and governing structures that would be needed to support the planned improvements.

The next step was to provide staff development and training for all those who would be involved in the new programs. The programs were then implemented. Monitoring and evaluation of the programs followed with a process called a Charters' Analysis. During this process the following four levels were documented.

1. Institutional commitments had been secured.
2. Organizational structures were in place.
3. Participant roles had been learned and were practiced.
4. Learning activities/programs were occurring as planned.

As the first year plan was being implemented and evaluated, the school's planning team began the process again to prepare the school's second year plan. Thus, school improvement became continuous and was characterized by on-going goal identification, assessment of present practices, staff development, refining implementation, and expanding and refining the original vision that was developed during the retreat and design meetings during the planning stages.

What is Occurring in the Oklahoma City Public Schools?

Representatives from nine schools participated in the October, 1986, /I/D/E/A/ School Improvement Program facilitators training session. In most cases the representatives included the school principal, a teacher, and a parent. The schools that participated were Parmelee, Western Village, Hayes, Capitol Hill Fifth, Jackson, Taft, Northwest Classen, Emerson, and Grant. The principal and teacher facilitator from each of these schools except Northwest Classen were interviewed by the authors of this report. A structured interview form was used. (Northwest Classen was not included as the program had not been implemented at that school.) The remainder of this section contains the implementation of the School Improvement Program at each building as described during the interviews.

Parmelee Elementary

The Parmelee stakeholders group was made up of five teachers, one principal, six parents and three business/community leaders. This group met six times during the 1986-87 and the 1987-88 school years to build a vision of what Parmelee should be like in five years. The meetings were focused on vision building. Many of the "getting to know you" and "experiential" exercises were deleted. The meetings were held on Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The principal provided brunch for the group each time.

The group participated in a planning retreat in the fall of 1987. The retreat was held on a Saturday at the park adjacent to the school. Instead of producing a report of prioritized objectives to achieve the nine principles of effective schools, this school wrote objectives toward the seven Oklahoma City Public Schools Board Goals. The decision to use the Board Goals came from a recommendation made by the business leaders on the team. These leaders felt that to do otherwise would lead to double or fragmented planning.

After the planning retreat, the Parmelee staff focused their energies on the self-study for the North Central Accreditation. Some of the stakeholders on the planning team assisted with the self-study. The school was visited by the North Central

Accreditation team during January, 1988.

The next step for the School Improvement Program was to form design task groups. The task for these groups is typically to prepare detailed plans for the initial improvement steps. As some time had elapsed since the planning retreat and some objectives for improvement had been implemented at the school, the groups were assigned the task of assessing how well the school was doing to date and refining or expanding the objectives for improvement. At the time of the interviews, the membership of these groups was being determined but no work had yet begun on the task.

A number of changes occurred at Parmelee as a result of the School Improvement Program. In order to help teach students about citizenship, a Student Council was organized for the third and fourth graders. Students registered to vote for a Student Council candidate. Guidelines for being a candidate were determined, and there were both primary and runoff elections. The Student Council selected the entertainer for a school function, chose "spirit days", and started a school store which was run by students. The Student Council had raised $150.00 thus far and planned to buy either flags or trees for the school.

Other changes at Parmelee included the citizen of the month award. Snapshots of the winners are displayed in the school hall

and also at Southwestern Bank. Parmelee has expanded the number of school adopters. Also, a number of parents and community leaders volunteered to talk to classes about their occupations. There appeared to be a more positive attitude among the school staff and more parental support. In addition, one parent donated the printing for a monthly newsletter.

The only reported hinderance to implementing the School Improvement Program was the difficulty in doing it at the same time as the North Central Accreditation self study and the Instructional Effectiveness Program.

Discussion of central office support needed to continue implementing the school improvement plan included allowing the school to focus on one or two issues important to the building. Also, the staff would like to see Parmelee's programs featured in the Inside Track, a within-district publication.

Western Village Elementary

A stakeholders group of 30 parents, school staff and central office staff was organized at Western Village during the second semester of the 1986-87 school year. Three planning meetings were held: one all day Saturday and two on Monday evenings. The team worked on group process skills and team building during the meetings. The group was ready to begin the vision building for the school when notification arrived that the principal would

be assigned to a different elementary school for the 1987-88 year. At that time the school improvement effort was put on hold. The current principal plans to begin the School Improvement Program again during the 1988-89 year.

Hayes Elementary

During 1986-87, the Hayes stakeholders group was composed of four teachers, one principal, six parents, one community representative and two high school students (graduates of Hayes). Two parents were added to the group for the 1987-88 year. This group met one-two times per month during the second semester of 1986-87. Most meetings were held on weekdays. Parents and teachers who were not on the planning team covered the classes of those who were involved. One meeting was held during the summer of 1987 at a local restaurant. During this time period, the group completed the readiness stage of the School Improvement Program and developed a five-year vision for Hayes. Attendance at the planning meetings was around 90%. The only regret expressed was the lack of active participation by community members other than parents.

The group held a day and one-half planning retreat at the Sheraton Hotel in Norman during the fall of 1987. The cost for the room was $200.00 which was paid by school funds. At that time a document was produced containing a vision statement and

objectives for the nine areas of school improvement. The report was distributed to all parents and staff members.

Membership for the design task groups was formed at the retreat. Membership consisted of some members of the original planning group as well as some new people being invited. At the time of the interviews these groups were meeting but had not yet finished their task.

For the most part, the principal led the planning sessions. The teacher and parent facilitators assisted in the small groups. The parent facilitator was unable to attend the second week of training so had difficulty helping facilitate after the completion of the visionary step.

Those interviewed mentioned a number of changes occurring in the school as a result of the school improvement process. Both the staff and the parents seem to be more aware of the needs and procedures of the school. The school climate is improved, and more parents seem to express an ownership for the school. During 1988-89, the school plans to implement a student orientation program at each grade, a parent education program explaining curriculum and expectations, and a Parent-Partnership program which will pair parents new to the school with veteran parents who can answer questions about the school.

Two requests were made of the central office to help Hayes continue the School Improvement Program. The staff endorses the concept of school improvement programs but would like to have the autonomy to select which program to work on at a time (for example, Effectiveness Training or North Central Accreditation). The decision would be based on the particular needs of the school. The school would also like to receive some financial support for the School Improvement Program and some help in recruiting members of the business community to serve on the planning team.

The facilitators described only one procedure that they would carry out differently if they had it to do over again. They would have deleted some of the pre-planning, readiness stage exercises and moved into vision building more quickly.

Capitol Hill Fifth Grade Center

A stakeholders group was formed at Capitol Hill Fifth Grade Center during the second semester of 1986-87. Membership consisted of ten teachers, four other school staff and ten parents. Three of the parents did not have children in the building at the time, but would have in the future. Four Saturday meetings were held. The principal, teacher and parent facilitators divided each session into three parts, and each led one part. The group completed the vision building for the school.

During the 1987-88 school year, Capitol Hill participated in the self-study for the North Central Accredidation process. As a result, work on the School Improvement Program was put aside. A meeting to reconvene the stakeholders was set for May 13, 1988. New parents were being recruited to serve. The plans were to review the group process skills and vision statements and then to proceed with the program.

Although Capitol Hill was still in the first stage of the school improvement process, some changes had occurred that were attributed to the program. In the fall of 1987, forty people participated in a school staff retreat. The retreat was conducted on a Friday night and Saturday at a local Ramada Inn. The purpose of the retreat was to allow the large number of staff members to get to know each other. As a result, the building climate had improved. The school also began publishing a monthly newsletter for staff and parents in an effort to keep everyone informed about school issues and events. Another positive change was the development of the Academic Challenge program. Students competed in music, creative writing, spelling, math, and expressive reading. The winners at the school then competed in a district-level competition.

The following kinds of central office support were requested to continue the School Improvement Program. Administrators who

attend the planning meetings were needed as stakeholders. Also the district should allow the school to use PTA resources to enable the planning team to meet during the work day. (Capitol Hill's PTA had agreed to substitute in the classrooms or to pay for district substitutes.) The facilitators would also have liked to meet with the /I/D/E/A/ school improvement facilitators in the Manhattan, Kansas, school district in order to see how their program had been implemented.

Those interviewed mentioned that the school improvement process at the fifth grade centers was especially challenging due to the fact that the students are in the building for only one year. Thus, five-year vision building was difficult. It was also difficult to maintain parental interest after their child left the school. The Capitol Hill team hoped to help meet the challenge by recruiting parents from its feeder schools to be stakeholders.

The only thing the facilitators would have done differently regarding school improvement would have been to work through the process more quickly. They wished that the objectives for the school had been completed during the first year of implementation.

Jackson Middle School

The school improvement facilitators at Jackson organized a stakeholders group during the 1986-87 school year. The original group was composed of seven teachers, four other school staff, two parents, five students, five central office staff and five businessmen. After the first meeting, however, only the school staff and students attended most subsequent planning meetings. The meetings were held on Saturday mornings and on Wednesdays after school.

A planning retreat was held in October, 1987, on a Friday evening and all day Saturday at a local Holiday Inn. Four hours of discussion about the nine principles occurred at the Friday meetings. On the following day, the group wrote the vision statement for the school as well as objectives for each of the nine principles.

The focus of all of the planning meetings was the business of vision building for the school. A number of training exercises were deleted.

Jackson began the self study for accreditation by North Central during 1987-88. At that time, work on the School Improvement Program was stopped. During the middle of the 1987-88 year, Jackson received a new principal who had not been trained in the school improvement process. At the time of the

interview, work on the School Improvement Program had not begun again, though plans were in place to follow through with implementing the vision. The current principal plans to receive training to facilitate the School Improvement Program in the fall of 1988.

A number of ways in which the central office could support the school improvement program at Jackson were mentioned. Central Office administrators could be active participants of the stakeholders group at the school. The school staff would also like to have the autonomy to implement the current school improvement projects before new programs are added.

Even though the School Improvement Program planning team is not currently meeting, there are some positive events occurring at the school as a result of the vision and objectives developed at the planning retreat. Students who served on the planning team are working to implement Jackson's vision through their leadership class. A peer helper program trains students in communication and listening skills so that they can help other students, one-on-one, with personal problems. The peer helpers also tutor students with academic problems. In addition, the peer helpers have helped Head Start students and the elderly from a nearby nursing home. A network of five parents volunteered to work to begin the PTSA organization again at Jackson. The school

conducted an awards assembly to acknowledge student achievement at the end of the first semester as well as the end of the school year. Planned Parenthood adopted Jackson and has provided two staff members to come to the school for half days to present a curriculum of values and choices to students. The Southwest Guidance Center works with high risk students by providing recreational therapeutic programs.

Despite the positive programs occurring, only a few staff members had been aware and focused on the vision developed for Jackson. The goal for the future was to broaden the scope of involvement to include the entire school community.

Taft Middle School

During the 1986-87 year, a stakeholders group was recruited at Taft. The group was composed of five teachers, three other school staff, five parents, six students, and two community representatives. The two community representatives were a local minister and an executive from OG&E. Efforts were made to include other members of the community. In the future, recruiting efforts for community members will focus on middle management or lower in the organizational charts of companies. The schedules of top executives did not allow the time required by the school improvement process.

The planning meetings at Taft were held once or twice a month during the school day on Friday. Teachers who were not on the planning team covered the classes of the teachers who were. In some cases, student teachers covered classes. Students on the planning team made up their school work. None of the parents on the planning team worked outside of the home. During these meetings the planning team developed a five-year vision for Taft.

The group held a two day retreat at a nearby Days Inn in May of 1987. During this time a report of objectives in the nine areas of school improvement was produced. The group identified two principles to be implemented during 1987-88: (a) The school explicitly teaches and rewards the agreed upon values of the school and community and (b) Parents are expected to be active participants in the education of their children. Membership on the design task groups was determined. Work on the school improvement plan slowed down considerably during 1987-88 when the school began the self-study for North Central Accreditation.

Those interviewed reported some changes occurring at Taft as a result of the school improvement process. A parent meeting was conducted during the first week of school to describe the list of essential skills for each grade level. The parent shadowing program as an alternative to suspension was also described. In the future, the school staff would like to meet with incoming

sixth grade students and their parents before school begins. During this time the students could be given their schedules and a tour of the school to facilitate finding their way around on the first day of school.

The school improvement process made the staff aware of things that needed to be done at the building. Much of the material from the School Improvement Program was used in the application for North Central Accreditation. In fact, the major educational priorities for North Central came from the objectives written for the School Improvement Program.

Central office support needed to continue the school improvement efforts at Taft included substitutes to allow teachers to attend the planning meetings. Money was also needed to cover refreshments and other small items needed during the meeting times. The staff would also like to have central office support to implement the plan that was developed, and which addresses the unique needs of Taft.

The facilitators for the school improvement program stated that the lack of time was the biggest hinderance to the implementation of the program.

Three key aspects made the program a success at Taft. The participants read many books and articles about effective schools and educational topics. Parents were involved and a spirit of cooperation was enhanced among the school staff.

Grant High School

The Grant stakeholders group was organized during the second semester of the 1986-87 school year. The group was composed of seven teachers, three other school staff, seven parents, five other community representatives and eight students. One of the parents was also a business person and another parent was also an educator. The group met once a month on Thursday evenings for eight sessions. The three facilitators, two teachers and the principal all shared in the planning and facilitating of the meetings.

A planning retreat was held in December, 1987. The retreat was financed by a combination of school funds, district funds and donations from school adopters. During the retreat, the group prioritized the nine principles of effective schools. Objectives were written for the top three principles. A vision statement was also composed. During the planning stages, some students were not able to continue due to conflicts with other activities and had to be replaced. The new students were paired with students who had been involved from the beginning to help them catch up with the program.

During the Spring of 1988, a seven member design task group met to prepare detailed plans for the initial improvement steps. The group included five members who were part of the original

stakeholders group and two members who were new to the program. The school planned to implement the program developed by the design task team during the Fall of 1988.

The result of parents and school staff working together on the School Improvement Program was increased parental attendance at the Open House. Parents made recommendations such as sending home flyers with the students and displaying students' work on the bulletin boards.

The request to central office to facilitate the implementation of the School Improvement Program was support for the new school programs. Additional funds would probably not be needed, but some established procedures would possibly need to change. The group also requested supplies and materials described in the School Improvement Program manual such as the film, "Cypher in the Snow".

The only constraint to the School Improvement Program mentioned was that time was not provided to meet during the day. The facilitators would have sped up the training process, and vision building stage, if they were to repeat the initial stages of the School Improvement Program. They would also have liked to involve more business people in the stakeholders group.

One of the successes of the process was the inclusion on the planning team of a skeptical teacher who was reluctant to trust

the ideas put forth by the program. By being involved in the School Improvement Program, the person became committed and was able to convince school staff who were not on the planning team of the merits of the program. Overall, the staff at Grant were receptive to the School Improvement Program and were looking forward to implementing the results of the design task team.

Emerson

The Emerson stakeholder group was organized in January of 1987. Membership included four teachers, three other school staff, two students, three group home parents, one member of the state legislature, one school board member, and two other community representatives. The group was facilitated by the principal, who coordinated and issued assignments, a vocational business teacher, who presented assignments, and a parent, who helped within the small groups. The stakeholders group met monthly on Mondays from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. During the meetings, team building and group process skills were learned and vision-building on the nine principles was accomplished.

It became necessary to replace student members of the stakeholders group midway through the process. To help the new students "catch up", a mini-version of the activities was provided to the new students by a planning team member.

In January of 1988, a three and one-half day planning retreat was held at a group member's home. At the retreat a report was produced containing a five-year vision statement for the school and seven outcome statements. Each outcome statement also had indicators of excellence, implementation tasks, person responsible and timelines for completion.

As specific plans were written during the retreat, the work of the design task group was well underway. To insure that plans were implemented, four planning group members were selected to monitor the activities for the first year. At the end of the year, a report was to be presented to the large stakeholders group who would make any necessary changes or modifications.

The design plan initially met with some resistance from the faculty not involved in the school improvement process. Therefore, the faculty advisory council was asked for input on all issues dealing with the faculty. Then the plan was redeveloped incorporating their suggestions.

A number of positive changes had occurred at Emerson as a result of the School Improvement Program process. To help encourage everyone not to litter, a trash can painting contest was held. Each month, teachers mailed notes to the parents of six students with poor attendance and to the home of five students stating something positive they have done. Notes were

also sent to students after they had their babies to encourage them to return to school. A horticulture class has begun, and landscaping around the school had improved. Students and staff were being rewarded for perfect attendance by free pizza coupons. Teachers were making their rooms more attractive with bulletin board displays. Health services, including pre and post-natal care, were being provided to students. Also successful Emerson alumni were making presentations to students.

To continue implementing the school improvement program, Emerson needed support from the central office in a number of areas. The maintenance department was needed to help maintain the efforts of an attractive environment. Staff Development was needed to provide the necessary training to implement the new programs. The resources of the Support Programs staff was also necessary to help write grants to fund the new programs. Financial support was needed to provide refreshments, etc., at the school improvement meetings. The school also needed more space as four teachers had no classroom of their own.

Emerson received many grants and donations to help with the school program. Representative Linda Larason contributed $200. A grant from GANNETT in the amount of $100,000 was received to cover the start-up costs of the new clinic and daycare center. The State Department donated $2,000 for childbirth classes. The

State Department of Vocational Education has also begun a new vocational program in childcare at Emerson.

Conclusions

Although the efforts of the School Improvement teams will probably have the maximum impact when each school reaches the implementation stage, benefits were occurring in each school as a result of participation in the School Improvement Program. Nearly all of those interviewed stated that the climate in their school had improved. As a result of feeling more ownership in their school, school staff, parents, and, in some cases, other community members were instigating improvements that needed to be made. In fact, the School Improvement Program provided a common outlet to direct the energy of all those who had a stake in what happened at their school. The focus of the program was positive as the task was to make the school more like an ideal school.

The planning teams did experience some difficulties in carrying out the School Improvement Program. Participating in the School Improvement Program was quite time consuming. As a result, none of the schools were able to prepare the self-study for North Central Accreditation and maintain an active School Improvement Program. Two schools mentioned that the work done during the first year of School Improvement Program was used extensively in the application for North Central accreditation. So, some overlap does appear to exist between North Central Accreditation and School Improvement Program.

It was difficult to maintain an active School Improvement Program when a change of principals occurred at the school. Also, some schools had a hard time recruiting and maintaining community and business representatives on the School Improvement teams.

Some of the schools voiced skepticisim that once they had developed procedures to meet the goals and objectives specific to their school, that central office might not support their ideas. Thus, those interviewed strongly expressed a desire for autonomy and for resources from central office to implement the procedures developed as a result of their programs.

Despite the constraints, all schools reported benefits as a result of participating in School Improvement Program regardless of which stage of implementation they had reached. As the benefits seemed to out weigh the costs, continued support for the site-based school improvement planning teams was recommended.

Epilogue

During the 1987-88 school year, representatives from 38 additional Oklahoma City Public Schools were trained to facilitate a School Improvement Program at their building. Those schools were:

Arthur
Britton
Buchanan
Columbus
Coolidge
Dewey
Dunbar
Fillmore
Garden Oaks
Gatewood
Hawthorne
Heronville
Hillcrest
Johnson
King
Lee
Linwood
Madison
Oakridge
Polk
Putnam Heights
Quail Creek
Rockwood
Southern Hills
Shidler
Spencer
Telstar
West Nichols Hills
Willow Brook
Wilson
Hoover
Rogers
Capitol Hill High
Douglass
John Marshall
Northeast
Southeast
Star Spencer

Plans have been made to provide training in the School Improvement process during 1988-89 to representatives from all schools which have not yet begun the program. So, by the end of the 1988-89 year all district schools should have started implementing School Improvement Programs.

References

Becher, R.M. (1984). Parent involvement: A review of research and principles of successful practice. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Burns, L.T., and Howes, J. (1988, August). Handing control to local schools: Site-based management sweeps the country. The School Administrator.

Casner-Lotto, J. (January, 1988). Expanding the teacher's role: Hammond's school improvement process. Phi Delta Kappan. pp. 349-353.

Dreyfuss, G. (1988, August). Dade county opens doors to site decisions. The School Administrator. pp. 12-15.

Goodson, B.D. and Hess, R.D. (May, 1975). Parents as teachers of young children: An evaluative review of some contemporary concepts and programs. Washington, DC: Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Office of Education.

Henderson, A. (Ed.). (1987). The evidence continues to grow: parent involvement improves student achievement. Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Leler, H. (1983). Parent education and involvement in relation to the schools and to parents of school age children. In R. Haskins and D. Addams (eds.), Parent education and public policy. Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX Publishing Co.

Table 1

/I/D/E/A/ School Improvement Program

Nine Principles

1. Education is increasingly used to prepare students for successful life transitions.

2. Schools make every effort to link students with appropriate community resources that could make a positive contribution to the student's education.

3. Students become increasingly self-directed through planned activities leading to self-educating adulthood.

4. Schools explicitly teach and reward the agreed upon values of the school and community.

5. Parents are expected to be active participants in the education of their children.

6. Each student pursues excellence in an area of his or her own choosing.

7. Everyone affected by a decision is involved directly or representatively in the making of it.

8. Schools strive to integrate the interdependent educational efforts of home, school, and community.

9. Every participant involved in education youth, models the role of learner.